

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to clarify the invention. Support for the amendments is found in Applicants' specification, for example, at page 11, lines 6-19, and the drawing figures. Claim 17 has been amended to correct a grammatical error. No new matter has been entered by any of the foregoing changes.

Turning to the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art Figures 1 and 2 (AAPA), claim 1 specifies a first semiconductor laser element directly mounted on a heat radiating block, a second semiconductor laser element mounted on the heat radiating block, and a dielectric layer that electrically insulates the first semiconductor laser element and the second semiconductor laser element from each other. The AAPA does not teach this.

Prior art FIG. 1 shows two semiconductor laser elements mounted on a heat radiating block via a dielectric layer to electrically insulate them from each other. Prior Art FIG. 2 shows two semiconductor laser elements mounted directly on a heat radiating block by electrically insulating them from each other with a pn junction formed on the heat radiating block. It is conventional in the art to employ the same structure when mounting a plurality of semiconductor laser elements. That is, when mounting a plurality of semiconductor laser elements, those skilled in the art would not intentionally adopt different constructions and methods for the semiconductor laser elements unless there is a particular reason. Therefore, when mounting the plurality of semiconductor laser elements, as described in prior art FIGs. 1 and 2, it is an obvious matter of design choice for those skilled in the art to mount a plurality of semiconductor laser elements on a heat radiating block directly or via a dielectric layer.

Namely, all semiconductor laser elements are mounted on the heat radiating block in a same manner.

The present invention ignores this conventional construction. Rather, as described in the summary of the invention, the present invention has been made to achieve the object of shortening the interval between light-emitting points as much as possible while considering the radiation performance of a semiconductor laser. That is why the invention intentionally adopts different constructions for providing the plurality of semiconductor laser elements. It is clearly unobvious based on the fact that, in the prior art cited in the rejection, there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of achieving a good balance between the radiation performance and the interval between light-emitting points. Thus, none of the constructions of the present invention claimed is employed. Thus, it is clear that the Examiner is employing impermissible hindsight, and is applying the teachings of the present invention to the AAPA to make out a case for obviousness. Thus, claim 1 and claims 2-4 which depend thereon, cannot be said to be obvious from the AAPA.

Turning to the rejection of claims 5-17 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over the AAPA in view of Uchisaki et al. (Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-011417), claims 5-16 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1. Claim 17 includes similar features as claim 1. The deficiencies of the AAPA are discussed vis-à-vis claim 1. Uchisaki et al. does not supply the missing teachings to achieve or render obvious claim 1 or claim 17, or claims 5-16 dependent upon claim 1. With respect to the foregoing, Uchisaki et al. simply teaches two laser arrays with different wavelengths and fails to teach any of the structural elements of claims 1 or 17. Thus, no combination of the AAPA and Uchisaki et al. can achieve or render obvious Applicants' claims.

Having dealt with all the objections raised by the Examiner, the Application is believed to be in order for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

In the event there are any fee deficiencies or additional fees are payable, please charge them (or credit any overpayment) to our Deposit Account Number 08-1391.

Respectfully submitted,



Norman P. Soloway
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 24,315

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" on March 27, 2006 at Tucson, Arizona.

By: 

NPS:dd/sb

HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.
3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE
SUITE 140
TUCSON, AZ 85718
TEL. 520.882.7623
FAX. 520.882.7643

175 CANAL STREET
MANCHESTER, NH 03101
TEL. 603.668.1400
FAX. 603.668.8567